## **PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

То:	PCT
KEIL & SCHAAFHAUSEN Cronstettenstrasse 66 60322 Frankfurt am Main ALLEMAGNE KEIL & SCHAAFHAUSEN PATENTANWALTE  03, Aug. 2004	WRITTEN OPINION  (PCT Rule 66)
03, Aug. 2004 28-3-, 14.3. M.B.	Date of mailing (day month year) 28/07/2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 01P2W0	REPLY DUE  within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. International filing dat	te (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/EP03/13162 24/11/2003	23/12/2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification	tion and IPC
B01J19/12 Applicant	
OUTOKUMPU OYJ	
This written opinion is the first drawn up by this International	
VI Certain documents cited  VII Certain defects in the international application  VIII Certain observations on the international application  VIII replicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.	gard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; ent  ion  y, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3.
Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments For the examiner's obligation to consider amendmen For an informal communication with the examiner, s  If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination r	ss, see Rule 66.4. Its and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. see Rule 66.6.
The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2	
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/	Authorized officer Examiner
European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2	Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)

( )

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.